



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,329	10/31/2000	Dave Parker	005220.P002	3235

7590 04/21/2006

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
Daniel E Ovanezian
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

ALAM, UZMA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/703,329		PARKER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Uzma Alam		2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-14,16-18,20-24,26-28,30-33,42,43 and 45-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-14,16-18,20-24,26-28,30-33,42,43 and 45-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/5/01, 10/31/00</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the amendment file February 9, 2006. Claims 46-48 have been added. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 16, 20, 26 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-18, 20-24, 26-28, 30-33, 42-43 and 45-48 are pending. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-18, 20-24, 26-28, 30-33, 42-43 and 45-48 represent a method for monitoring events on a system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-18, 20-24, 26-28, 30-33, 42-43 and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carleton et al. US Patent Publication No. 2001/0044840.

Carleton teaches the invention as claimed including a method and apparatus for connecting to a host system and generating notifications (see abstract).

As per claim 1, Carleton teaches a method, comprising:

accessing a port of a host system by a satellite system to monitor an internal parameter [status and statistics about device operation; line 2 or paragraph 0050] for a predetermined event related to the host system (a system is monitored by logging on to ports of certain system elements; paragraph 0054, 0062-0070);

Art Unit: 2157

transferring data about the predetermined event from the satellite system to a monitoring operations center (remote network monitoring system 20; pp 0050)

generating, by a monitoring operations center, a notification upon the occurrence of the predetermined event to a first person in a hierarchy (the business rules define normal functions and notification rules, if a function is not being performed as expected, a notification is sent; paragraph 0053); and

escalating, by the monitoring operations center, the notification to a second person in the hierarchy when the first person fails to acknowledge the notification in a time period (notifications are escalated, as defined by the business rules; paragraph 0009, 0053, 0054, 0079).

As per claim 2, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising determining whether the notification is successful (each notification as an acknowledgement flag; paragraph 0053, 0079).

As per claim 3, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the predetermined event is receipt of a state change of the internal parameter (the monitoring system checks for state changes of system elements; paragraph 0054).

As per claim 4, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the predetermined event is exceeding a threshold value set for the internal parameter (paragraph 0053).

As per claim 5, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising generating the notification a number of times for an amount of time (paragraph 0053).

As per claim 6, Carleton teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the number of times, the amount of time, and the time period are configurable (the business rules, which set notification rules can be configured by a user; paragraph 0051 ,0062-0070, 0079).

As per claim 7, Carleton teaches a method comprising:
monitoring a host system for a parameter corresponding to a predetermined event using a satellite system located locally to the host system (paragraph 0049, 0054, 0062-0070, 0080);
queuing data about the predetermined event collected by the satellite system (pp 0084);
transferring the queued data from the host system to a monitoring operations center (0085);
generating, by the monitoring operations center located remotely from the host system, a notification upon the occurrence of the predetermined event to a first person in a hierarchy (paragraph 0050, 0053); and

escalating, by the monitoring operations center, the notification to a second person in the hierarchy when the first person fails to acknowledge the notification in a time period (paragraph 0009, 0053, 0054, 0079).

As per claim 9, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, further

Art Unit: 2157

comprising providing a possible cause of the predetermined event occurrence (paragraph 0081)

As per claim 10, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, where escalation is based on a set of rules (paragraph 0054, 0062-0070, 0079).

As per claim 11, Carleton teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the set of rules is based on a time delay between the notification and the acknowledgement (paragraph 0054, 0079).

As per claim 12, Carleton teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the set of rules is based on the state change (paragraph 0053, 0079).

As per claim 13, Carleton teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the set of rules is based on schedules of the first and second persons (paragraph 0053, 0062-0070).

As per claim 14, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the notification is generated and escalated automatically (paragraph 0053).

As per claim 16, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, is further comprising monitoring a service of the host system (paragraph 0054, 0084).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 17, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the parameter is a utilization of a component of the host system (paragraph 0084).

As per claim 18, Carleton teaches the method of claim 17, further comprising:

monitoring additional parameters of the host system, wherein the additional parameters include a service of the host system (paragraph 0084); and eliminating a redundant notification based on dependent parameters of the host system; paragraph 0080).

As per claim 20, Carleton teaches a machine readable medium having stored thereon instructions, which when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the following:

Receiving, by a monitoring operations center data about an occurrence of a predetermined event related to a host system, the occurrence of the predetermined event determined by access of a port of the host system by a satellite system (paragraph 0054, 0062-0070, 0080);

Generating, by the monitoring operations center, a notification upon the occurrence of the predetermined event to a first person in a hierarchy (paragraph 0053) and

Escalating, by the monitoring operations center, the notification to a second person in the hierarchy when the first person fails to acknowledge the notification in a time period (paragraph 0009, 0053, 0054, 0079); and

Providing at least one of a suggestion of a probable cause of the predetermined event and a solution to the occurrence of the predetermined event (pp 0084-0087).

As per claim 21, Carleton teaches the machine readable medium of claim 20, wherein the predetermined event is receipt of a state change of the parameter (paragraph 0053, 0079).

As per claim 22, Carleton teaches the machine readable medium of claim 20, wherein the processor further performs generating the notification a number of times for an amount of time (paragraph 0053).

As per claim 23, Carleton teaches the machine readable medium of claim 20, wherein the number of times, the amount of time, and the time period are configurable (paragraph 0051, 0062-0070, 0079).

As per claim 24, Carleton teaches the machine readable medium of claim 20, wherein the processor further performs providing a suggestion as to a cause of the predetermined event occurrence (paragraph 0081).

As per claim 26, Carleton teaches an apparatus, comprising:
means for monitoring a host system for a parameter corresponding to a predetermined event; (paragraph 0054, 0062-0070); means for generating a notification upon the occurrence of the predetermined event to a first person in a hierarchy (paragraph 0053); and

means for escalating the notification to a second person in the hierarchy when the first person fails to acknowledge the notification in a time period (paragraph 0009, 0053, 0054, 0079).

As per claim 27, Carleton teaches the apparatus of claim 26, further comprises means for determining whether the notification is successful (paragraph 0053, 0079).

As per claim 28, Carleton teaches the apparatus of claims 26, further comprising:

means for generating the notification a number of times for an amount of time (paragraph 0053).

As per claim 30, Carleton teaches an apparatus, comprising:

A configuration portal to interface with satellite system over a communication link and configure a service interleave factor of a host system (paragraph 0051, 0054, 0062-0070); a digital processing system coupled to the portal, the digital processing system to receive data indicative of an occurrence of the event and generate a first notification (paragraph 0053);

and a notification gateway coupled to the digital processing system to transmit the first notification to a first communication device, the digital processing system to generate a second notification to a second communication device if an acknowledgment is not received within a predetermined time (paragraph 0009, 0053, 0054, 0079).

As per claim 31, Carleton teaches the apparatus of claim 30, wherein the notification gateway transmits the second notification to the second communication device (paragraph 0049, 0050).

As per claim 32, Carleton teaches the apparatus of claim 30, wherein the digital processing system comprises a server (paragraph 0049, 0050).

As per claim 33, Carleton teaches the apparatus of claim 30, further comprising a proxy server coupled to the digital processing system (paragraph 0049, 0050).

As per claims 42 and 45, Carleton teaches the method of claims 1 and 20, wherein generating further comprises transmitting the occurrence of the predetermined event from the satellite system to the monitoring operation center (paragraph 0009).

As per claims 43, Carleton teaches the method of claims 7 and 15, wherein the parameter of the host system is monitored by a satellite system, and wherein generating the notification further comprises transmitting the occurrence of the predetermined event from the satellite system to the monitoring operations center (the front end or expert system of a spacecraft constantly monitors function on the spacecraft and sends via satellite logs of the events to the monitoring operation center (SERS), the SERS monitors these log files constantly and sends notifications to personnel (SCT); paragraph 4, lines 1-8, paragraph 5, lines 1-7, paragraph 7, lines 1-8, paragraph 8, paragraph 9).

As per claim 46, Carleton teaches the method of claim 1, wherein accessing the port of the host system to monitor the internal parameter comprises logging into the host system (pp 0054, 0058, 0092).

As per claim 47, Carleton teaches the method of claim 7, wherein queuing the data comprises queuing different types of the data in different ones of multiple queues and wherein the method further comprises prioritizing the transferring of the queued data from the multiple queues (p 0075-0076).

As per claim 48, Carleton teaches the apparatus of claim 30 wherein the service interleave factor determines how a plurality of service checks are interleaved (pp 0080-0882).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's argument that the reference Carleton does not teach an internal parameter of the host system as recited in Claim 1, Applicant is directed to line 2 of paragraph 0050. In this paragraph, the reference teaches that the "monitoring software located on the client server 22 collects status and statistics about device operation in the client network." According to the specification of the current application, on page 7, line 16, statistics of the device are considered parameters of the host. Also, on page 7 of the specification, the application states

Art Unit: 2157

that a state change is also considered a parameter of the host. The reference Carleton teaches monitoring state changes in paragraph 0054.

Applicant argues that Carleton does not teach the queue of data collected by its client server as recited in claim 7. Applicant is directed to paragraphs 0049-0050 and 0080-0085 in response to this argument. In these paragraphs, the reference teaches that data is collected on an interval basis and then is sent to the remote monitoring server.

As per applicant's argument regarding claim 20, applicant argues that Carleton does not teach providing at least one of a suggestion of probable cause of the predetermined event and a solution to the occurrence of the predetermined event. However, in paragraph 0084, the reference Carleton teaches that the cause of the alarm is indicated in the report generated by the monitoring system.

As per applicant's argument regarding claim 30, applicant argues that Carleton does not teach configuring a service interleave factor. However, in paragraph 0051, Carleton teaches that the notifications and alarms are sent to various devices and are sent even if the device being monitored is not functioning.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2157

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uzma Alam whose telephone number is (571) 272-3995. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday 5:30 AM - 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Uzma Alam
Ua
September 12, 2005


MOUSTAF A M. MEKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER